

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/799,810 | 03/12/2004 | William W. Shumway | HES 2003-IP-012703U1 | 8358 |
| 28857 CRAIG W. RO | 7590 12/27/2007 | | EXAM | INER |
| HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES | | | FIGUEROA, JOHN J | |
| P.O. BOX 1431 DUNCAN, OK 73536-0440 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| , | | | 1796 | - |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/27/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/799,810 | SHUMWAY ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | John J. Figueroa | 1796 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with | n the correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realiure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 36(a). In no event, however, may a repvill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI, cause the application to become ABA | ATION. Dly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 O | ctober 2007. | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) <u>1-41 and 63-66</u> is/are pending in the a | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-41 and 63-66</u> is/are rejected. | • | • | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attached | Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: | priority under 35 U.S.C. § | 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior | rity documents have been r | eceived in this National Stage | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau | ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Su | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | | /Mail Date ormal Patent Application | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/18/07 & 9/25/07. | 6) Other: | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/799,810 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1-9, 11-41, 63, 65 and 66 as unpatentable over United States Patent Number (USPN) 5,990,050 to Patel et al., (hereinafter 'Patel') in view of "Amphiphilic Copolymers", Langmuir 1998, 14, 5977-79, (hereinafter 'Perrin') has been maintained for reasons previously made of record in item 10 on page 5 of the Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, hereinafter 'OA'.
- 2. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 64 as unpatentable over Patel in view of Perrin (as applied above to independent claims 1, 29 and 63) and further in view of "Crude Oil Emulsions: A State of the Art Review", SPE 77497, hereinafter 'Kokal' has been maintained for reasons previously made of record in item 11 on page 7 of OA.

Response to Arguments

The 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection over Patel and Perrin (item 10 of OA)

3. Applicant's arguments in the response to OA filed October 5, 2007 (hereinafter 'Response) with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1-9, 11-41, 63, 65 and 66 as unpatentable over Patel in view of Perrin have been fully considered but deemed unpersuasive.

Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

In response to Applicant's primary argument concerning Perrin not expressly teaching the emulsion facilitating particle to be "solid", Perrin teaches the polymeric emulsifier to be a hydrophobically-modified poly(sodium acrylate) having hydrophobic alkyl chains grafted onto a negatively charged backbone having a molecular weight of 50,000 g/mol. It is well known that polysodium acrylate (PSA), and grafted and/or crosslinked polymers thereof, are water-swellable solid resin materials commonly used as water-absorbents in various applications. (See, e.g., USPN 4,727,097 to Kobayashi et al., col. 2, lines 16-47 disclosing grafted PSA polymers as highly water-absorptive resins; USPN 4,735,987 to Morita et al., col. 1, lines 17-41, teaching polysodium acrylate polymers as advantageous water-absorbent resin polymers; USPN 4,806,578 to Kobayashi et al., col. 2, line 43 to col. 3, line 14, disclosing PSA and grafted starch-PSA polymers as hydrophilic water-absorptive resin agents; USPN 4,826,680 to Lesniak et al., col. 3, lines 19-52; claims 5, 9, 18 and 22, teaching crosslinked PSA polymers as effective water-insoluble, water-swellable resin materials; USPN 6,107,358 A to Harada et al., col. 1, lines 23-35, teaching cross-linked PSA as a typical example of a water-absorbent resin; and the Japanese Abstract to JP 360179485 A to Miyayama et al., disclosing a graft of starch with PSA as a high-molecular, water-swellable material for "waterstopping") [Examiner notes that these references are cited only as evidence of what is commonly known in the art and not relied upon as grounds for the instant rejection.]

Consequently, because PSA and grafts thereof are known as water-insoluble, water-swellable absorbent resin materials, they must be solid particles in *at least* the aqueous phase in Patel's invert emulsion (or in the presently claimed fluid).

In response to Applicant's arguments that VERSACOAT® and NOVAMUL®, disclosed in Patel as examples of a wetting agent/emulsifier for use in the composition, can also act as surfactants (and not just emulsifying agents), these emulsifiers are examples of a preferred embodiment in Patel. "Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments." *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. MPEP 2123

Thus, the instant claims remain unpatentable over Patel and Perrin.

The 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection over Patel, Perrin and Kokal (item 11 of OA)

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to these 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 64 as unpatentable over Patel in view of Perrin, and further in view of Kokal, have been fully considered but deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant did not provide any substantive arguments in Response traversing the instant rejection except to state that the instant claims depend from independent claims

Art Unit: 1796

that are allegedly patentable over Patel and Perrin. However, Applicant's arguments concerning Patel and Perrin were addressed above and were found unpersuasive.

Thus, the instant claims remain unpatentable over Patel, Perrin and Kokal.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Figueroa whose telephone number is (571) 272-8916. Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/799,810 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJF/RAG

MARC S. ZIMMER